

On Integrable Structure behind the Generalized WDVV Equations

A. Morozov
ITEP, Moscow

ABSTRACT

In the theory of quantum cohomologies the WDVV equations imply integrability of the system $(I\partial_\mu - zC_\mu)\psi = 0$. However, in generic situation – of which an example is provided by the Seiberg-Witten theory – there is no distinguished direction (like t^0) in the moduli space, and such equations for ψ appear inconsistent. Instead they are substituted by $(C_\mu\partial_\nu - C_\nu\partial_\mu)\psi \sim (F_\mu\partial_\nu - F_\nu\partial_\mu)\psi = 0$, where matrices $(F_\mu)_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\alpha\partial_\beta\partial_\mu F$.

1 Quantum Cohomologies (a brief summary)

The WDVV (Witten-Dijkgraaf-Verlinde-Verlinde) equations [1] are an important ingredient of the theory of quantum cohomologies ($2d$ topological σ -models) and play a role in the formulation of mirror transform. The central object in these studies is the *prepotential*: a function of “time”-variables¹ $F(t^\alpha)$, which satisfies the WDVV equations:

$$C_\mu C_\nu = C_\nu C_\mu, \quad \forall \mu, \nu. \quad (1)$$

Here C_μ are matrices,

$$(C_\mu)_\beta^\alpha = \eta^{\alpha\gamma}(F_\mu)_{\gamma\beta}, \quad (F_\mu)_{\alpha\beta} = F_{\mu\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial t^\alpha \partial t^\beta \partial t^\mu} \quad (2)$$

¹ If the prepotential is interpreted as the “quantum” deformation of the generating function of intersection numbers on some manifold M (a Gromov-Witten functional for M), the variables t^α are associated with “observables” ϕ_α – the elements of the cohomology ring $H^*(M)$. Basically,

$$F(t) = \langle \exp \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\dim H^*(M)} t^\alpha \phi_\alpha \right) \rangle_0$$

and the “metric”

$$\eta_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} = (F_0)_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial t^0 \partial t^\alpha \partial t^\beta}, \quad \eta^{\alpha\beta} \eta_{\beta\gamma} = \delta_\gamma^\alpha. \quad (3)$$

In *conventional* theory of quantum cohomologies there is a distinguished variable t^0 (associated with the unity $\phi_0 = I$ in the ring $H^*(M)$), such that the metric $\eta = \eta^{(0)} = F_0$ in (3) is constant:

$$\partial \eta / \partial t^\alpha = 0 \quad (4)$$

As a corollary, the matrices F_μ and C_μ are independent of t^0 . In these circumstances the set of WDVV equations (1) together with the relations (2) – saying that the “structure constants” C_μ are essentially the third derivatives of a single function $F(t)$ – implies the consistency condition

$$[\mathcal{D}_\mu(z), \mathcal{D}_\nu(z)] = 0 \quad \forall \mu, \nu \quad (5)$$

for the set of differential equations [2]

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu(z) \psi_z = \left(I \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu} - z C_\mu(t) \right) \psi_z(t) = 0 \quad \left(\partial_\mu \psi_z^\alpha = z C_{\mu\beta}^\alpha \psi_z^\beta \right) \quad (6)$$

with arbitrary “spectral parameter” z .

This reveals an integrable (Whitham-like) structure behind the conventional WDVV equations. (Direct interpretation of (6) is in terms of deformations of the Hodge structures on Kahler manifolds.)

The “Baker-Ahiezer vector-function” $\psi_z(t)$ has various interpretations.

First, [3, 4], as a function of z it is a generating function of the correlators, linear in gravitational descendants (Morita-Mumford classes) $c^n(\phi)$:

$$\psi_{z,\rho}^\alpha(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \langle c^n(\phi_\rho) \phi^\alpha e^{\sum_\beta t^\beta \phi_\beta} \rangle_0 \quad (7)$$

Thus ψ_z is an important part of the reconstruction of the *full spherical* prepotential $\mathcal{F}_0(t_n^\alpha) = \langle \exp \sum_{\alpha,n} t_n^\alpha c^n(\phi_\alpha) \rangle_0$, $\#(\alpha) = \dim H^*(M)$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$ – the generating function of correlators with arbitrary number of descendants. Original prepotential appears when all descendant time-variables vanish:

$$F(t_0^\alpha) = \mathcal{F}_0(t_n^\alpha)|_{t_{n \geq 1}^\alpha = 0}$$

When descendants are included, ψ_z satisfies a hierarchy of quadratic equations

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_n^\mu} \psi_{z,\rho}^\alpha = \eta^{\alpha\gamma} \langle c^m(\phi_\mu) \phi_\gamma \phi_\beta \rangle \psi_{z,\rho}^\beta = \psi_{z,\rho}^\beta \oint \frac{dy}{y^{m+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_0^\beta} \psi_{y,\mu}^\alpha \quad (8)$$

which is the “quasiclassical” limit of some *full* (i.e. possessing a group-theory interpretation in the spirit of [5]) integrable hierarchy – to which the *full* prepotential, the generating function of all correlators for all genera, is a solution.

Second, the function ψ_z usually possesses integral representations of the form

$$\psi_z^\alpha(t) = \int_\Gamma \Omega_z^\alpha(t) \quad (9)$$

along some cycles on some manifold $\tilde{M}$ – which is interpreted as a *mirror* of M . In concrete examples (see, for example, [4]) this representation is implied by the hidden group-theory structure behind integrable system (6), which allows to interpret ψ_z as eigenfunctions of Casimir operators. Such eigenfunctions are well known to possess natural integrable representations, see [6] and references therein.

Clarification of these constructions, associating some (loop) algebra with a manifold, remains an interesting open question.

2 WDVV Equations in Seiberg-Witten Theory

The WDVV-like equations are now known to arise in a somewhat broader context than conventional quantum cohomologies. Namely, one can relax the condition (4) and study the WDVV equations in the situation when there is no distinguished modulus t^0 and no distinguished metric $\eta^{(0)}$. Such situation arises, for example, in Seiberg-Witten theory [7] of low-energy effective actions for $N = 2$ SUSY Yang-Mills models in four and five dimensions. This theory is long known to involve integrable structures [8] and the prepotential (quasiclassical τ -function) theory [9]. The WDVV-like equations arise in Seiberg-Witten theory in the form [10]:

$$\begin{aligned} F_\mu F_\lambda^{-1} F_\nu &= F_\nu F_\lambda^{-1} F_\mu, \quad \forall \lambda, \mu, \nu \\ (F_\mu)_{\alpha\beta} &= \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \partial_\mu F \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

i.e. the role of the metric η can be played by any matrix F_λ (actually, by any linear combination of such matrices). Accordingly, the mutually commuting matrices $C_\mu^{(\lambda)} = F_\lambda^{-1} F_\mu$,

$$\left[C_\mu^{(\lambda)}, C_\nu^{(\lambda)} \right] = 0 \quad \forall \mu, \nu \quad (11)$$

are now implicitly dependent on the choice of λ .²

However, since generically there is no constant (moduli-independent) matrix F_λ , the generalized WDVV equations (10) no longer imply (6). This system of

² To avoid confusion, the set (10) is not richer than (1), as it can seem: (10) with any *given* λ immediately implies the equations for all other λ .

consistent equations is instead substituted by³

$$\left(\partial_\mu - C_\mu^{(\lambda)}\partial_\lambda\right)\psi = 0 \quad \forall \mu, \lambda \quad (12)$$

or, in a more symmetric form,

$$(F_\lambda\partial_\mu - F_\mu\partial_\lambda)\psi = 0 \quad \forall \mu, \lambda \quad (13)$$

It is easy to see that the operators with different μ at the l.h.s. commute with each other:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\left(\partial_\mu - C_\mu^{(\lambda)}\partial_\lambda\right), \left(\partial_\nu - C_\nu^{(\lambda)}\partial_\lambda\right)\right] = \left[C_\mu^{(\lambda)}, C_\nu^{(\lambda)}\right]\partial_\lambda^2 + \\ & + \left((\partial_\nu C_\mu^{(\lambda)}) - (\partial_\mu C_\nu^{(\lambda)}) + C_\mu^{(\lambda)}(\partial_\lambda C_\nu^{(\lambda)}) - C_\nu^{(\lambda)}(\partial_\lambda C_\mu^{(\lambda)})\right)\partial_\lambda \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The first term at the r.h.s. vanishes due to the WDVV equations, and the second one can be seen to vanish if the definition of $C_\mu^{(\lambda)}$ is used together with the fact that F_μ are matrices, consisting of third derivatives. Eq.(13) is (12), multiplied by a matrix F_λ from the left.

It can still seem non-obvious that equations (13) are all consistent, i.e. that the vector ψ can be chosen in a λ -independent way. This follows from the relation:

$$\begin{aligned} & F_\mu\partial_\nu - F_\nu\partial_\mu = \\ & = F_\mu(\partial_\nu - C_\nu^{(\lambda)}\partial_\lambda) - F_\nu(\partial_\mu - C_\mu^{(\lambda)}\partial_\lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In order to return back from the generic system (12) to (6), it is enough to choose $\psi = e^{zt^0}\psi_z$, what is a self-consistent ansatz when all the $C_\mu^{(0)}$ are t^0 -independent.

There is no spectral parameter in the system (13), instead it is homogeneous (linear) in derivatives and possesses many solutions. They can be formally represented in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t) &= P \exp \int^t \left(dt^\mu C_\mu^{(\lambda)}\partial_\lambda\right) = \left\{ I + \left(\int^t dt_1^\mu C_\mu^{(\lambda)}(t_1) + \right. \right. \\ &= \left. \left. + \int^t dt_1^\mu C_\mu^{(\lambda)}(t_1)\partial_\lambda \left(\int^{t_1} dt_2^\nu C_\nu^{(\lambda)}(t_2)\right) + \dots \right) \partial_\lambda \right\} \tilde{\psi}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and one can choose, for example, $\tilde{\psi}(t) = e^{zt^\lambda}$. Then different terms of expansion of (16) in z are different solutions to (12).

³ As well as I understand such equations *per se* were studied as an alternative to (6) by B.Dubrovin (see ref.[1]) and other authors – but in the context of conventional quantum cohomology theory, with distinguished t^0 -direction.

As a simplest example, one can take

$$F = \frac{1}{2} (t_1^2 \log t_1 + t_2^2 \log t_2 + (t_1 - t_2)^2 \log(t_1 - t_2)) \quad (17)$$

which is the perturbative prepotential for $SU(3)$ $N = 2$ SYM model in $4d$. Then the first few solution to (13) are:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} t_1^2 - 2t_1 t_2 \\ t_2^2 - 2t_1 t_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \psi &= \begin{pmatrix} t_1^3 - 2t_1^2 t_2 \\ -t_1^2 t_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} t_1^3 - 2t_1^2 t_2 \\ -t_1^2 t_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} -t_1 t_2^2 \\ t_2^3 - 2t_1 t_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

By the way, $\psi^\alpha = t^\alpha$ is always a solution to (13) – this follows immediately from the definition of F_μ 's as the matrices of the 3-rd derivatives, which are symmetric under permutations of indices.

3 Conclusion and acknowledgements

The purpose of this letter is to explain that appropriate integrable structure on the moduli space exists behind the generalized WDVV equations, i.e. existence of a constant metric is not needed for such structure to emerge. I do not touch here neither interpretation, nor implications of this simple statement. They will be discussed elsewhere.

I appreciate illuminating discussions with A.Losev. This work was partly supported by the grant RFFI 96-15-96939.

References

- [1] E.Witten, *Surv.Diff.Geom.* **1** (1991) 243;
R.Dijkgraaf, E.Verlinde and H.Verlinde, *Nucl.Phys.* **B352** (1991) 59;
B.Dubrovin, *Geometry of 2D Topological Field Theories*, hep-th/9407018;
M.Kontsevich and Yu.Manin, *Comm.Math.Phys.* **164** (1994) 525.
- [2] K.Saito, *Publ.RIMS* **19** (1983) 1231;
B.Block and A.Varchenko, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A7** (1992) 1467;
B.Dubrovin, "Geometry and Integrability of Topological-Anti-topological Fusion", preprint INFN-8/92-DSF;
S.Cecotti and C.Vafa, *Comm.Math.Phys.* **158** (1993) 569, hep-th/9211097.
- [3] A.Losev, *Theor.Math.Phys.* **95** (1993) 595, hep-th/9211089; *JETP Lett.* **65** (1997) 374;
T.Eguchi, *Phys.Lett.* **B305** (1993) 235;
A.Losev and I.Polyubin, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A10** (1995) 4161, hep-th/9305079.

- [4] A.Givental, alg-geom/9612001.
- [5] A.Morozov, *Russian Physics Uspekhi* **37** (1994) 1, hep-th/9303139; hep-th/9502091;
L.Vinet et al., hep-th/9409093;
A.Gerasimov, S.Khoroshkin, D.Lebedev, A.Mironov et al., *Int.J.Mod.Phys* **A10** (1995) 2589, hep-th/9405011;
A.Mironov, L.Vinet et al., *Theor.Math.Phys.* **100** (1995) 890, hep-th/9312213.
- [6] A.Gerasimov, S.Kharchev, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov, M.Olshanetsky et al. *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A12** (1997) 2523, hep-th/9601161.
- [7] N.Seiberg and E.Witten, *Nucl.Phys.* **B426** (1994) 19, hep-th/9407087; *Nucl.Phys.* **B431** (1994) 484, hep-th/9408099.
- [8] A.Gorsky, I.Krichever, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov et al., *Phys.Lett.* **B355** (1995) 466, hep-th/9505035;
E.Martinec and N.Warner, hep-th/9509161;
R.Donagi and E.Witten, hep-th/9510101.
- [9] I.Krichever, hep-th/9205110; *Comm.Math.Phys.* **143** (1992) 415;
B.Dubrovin, *Nucl.Phys.* **B379** (1992) 627;
T.Nakatsu and K.Takasaki, hep-th/9509162;
H.Itoyama et al. *Nucl.Phys.* **B491** (1997) 529, hep-th/9512161.
- [10] A.Marshakov, A.Mironov et al., *Phys.Lett.* **B389** (1996) 43, hep-th/9607109; *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A12** (1997) 773, hep-th/9701014; hep-th/9701123.